



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/786,865	06/27/2001	Itzhak Wilf	P-1925-US	7287
27130	7590	07/02/2004	EXAMINER	
EITAN, PEARL, LATZER & COHEN ZEDEK LLP 10 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA, SUITE 1001 NEW YORK, NY 10020			KIBLER, VIRGINIA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	9

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/786,865

Applicant(s)

WILF ET AL.

Examiner

Virginia M Kibler

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: “sequented” should be changed to “subsequent” in line 6. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Girod (6,483,532).

Regarding claim 47, Girod discloses tracking face segments 356 in a video track (Figure 3), detecting segments having mouth motion 358 (Figure 3), and estimating from the detected segments, those having talking mouth motion vs. non-talking mouth motion (Abstract; Col. 6, lines 49-67, Col. 7, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 48, Girod discloses segments estimated to have talking mouth motion are enabled for attaching speech to a speaker in a face segment (Col. 10, lines 25-33).

Art Unit: 2623

4. Claims 1-6, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 32-35, 37, 39-42, 49, 50, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling").

Regarding claim 1, Ariki et al. ("Ariki") discloses processing a collection of images to extract therefrom features characteristic of a class of objects (Sect. 1-4) and grouping the images according to the extracted features helpful in identifying individual members of the class of objects (Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 2, Ariki discloses the collection of images representing a sequence of video frames (Abstract).

Regarding claim 3, Ariki discloses grouping of images in groups according to extracted features helpful in identifying individual members of a class produces a track of continuous frames for each individual member of the class of objects to be identified (Abstract; Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 4, Ariki discloses the groups of images are stored in a database store for use in searching or browsing for individual members of a class (Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 5, Ariki discloses the class of objects is human faces (Abstract).

Regarding claim 6, Ariki discloses the collection of images representing a sequence of video frames and the grouping including forming face tracks of contiguous frames (Sect. 1), each track including time sections (Abstract), thereby including the starting and ending frames, and containing face regions (Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 17, Ariki discloses the sequence of video frames is process to include annotations (e.g. name) associated with the face track (Abstract; Sect. 8).

Regarding claim 18, Ariki discloses the sequence of video frame is processed to include face characteristic views associated with the face tracks (Sect. 4).

Regarding claim 22, Ariki discloses processing a sequence of video frames to extract therefrom facial features and grouping the video frames to produce face tracks of contiguous frames each face track being identified by the starting and ending frames in the track (Abstract; Sect. 1) and containing face characteristic data of an individual face (Sect. 1, Sect. 3-4).

Regarding claim 23, Ariki discloses the face tracks are stored in a face index for use in searching or browsing for individual faces (Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 27, Ariki discloses detecting predetermined facial features in a frame and utilizing the facial features for estimating a head boundary for the respective face (Sect. 1; Sect. 3-4), opening a tracking window based on the estimated head boundary, and utilizing the tracking window for tracking subsequent frames which include the predetermined facial feature (Sect. 6).

Regarding claims 29 and 30, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claims 17 and 18 are applicable to claims 29 and 30, respectively.

Regarding claim 32, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claims 1 and 17 are applicable to claim 32.

Regarding claims 33-35, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claims 1-3 are applicable to claims 33-35, respectively.

Regarding claims 37 and 39, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claims 6 and 18 are applicable to claims 37 and 39, respectively.

Regarding claim 40, Ariki discloses annotating the names to each entry in the index (Abstract; Sect. 8).

Regarding claim 41, Ariki discloses the descriptions are applied manually during an editing operation (Sect 1, para. 3).

Regarding claim 42, Ariki discloses the description are applied automatically by means of a stored dictionary (Sect. 6).

Regarding claim 49, Ariki discloses processing a sequence of video frames to generate a face index having a plurality of entries, and attaching descriptions to entries in the face index (Abstract; Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 50, Ariki discloses attaching descriptions from the face index to at least one video frame (Sect. 8).

Regarding claim 58, Ariki discloses processing a collection of images to generate an index of a class of objects (Abstract), and searching the index for individual members of the class of objects (Abstract; Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 59, Ariki discloses the collection of images are a sequence of video frames (Abstract).

Regarding claim 60, Ariki discloses processing the sequence of video frames producing a track of sequential frames for each individual member of the class of objects (Abstract; Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 61, Ariki discloses the class of objects are human faces (Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wactlar et al. (5,835,667) in view of Girod (6,483,532).

Regarding claim 43, Wactlar et al. ("Wactlar") discloses generating an index from a video track (Col. 11, lines 43-63, Col. 12, lines 1-40), generating a transcription of the audio track (Col. 7, lines 39-67, Col. 8, lines 1-14), and aligning the transcription with the video index (Col. 8, lines 15-19). Wactlar discloses generating an index from a video track including image recognition (Col. 1, lines 7-11) and tracking objects (Col. 11, lines 43-67, Col. 12, lines 1-40) but does not expressly disclose generating a face index. However, Girod discloses detecting and tracking a face from a video signal (Figure 3; Col. 6, lines 58-67, Col. 7, lines 1-21). Wactlar and Girod are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of video processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the video indexing disclosed by Wactlar to specify generating a face index. The motivation for doing so would have been because it is a methodology routinely implemented in the art and allows for speaker identification. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined Wactlar with Girod to obtain the invention as specified in claim 43.

Regarding claim 44, Wactlar discloses the transcription is generated by closed-caption decoding (Col. 7, lines 39-64).

Regarding claim 45, Wactlar discloses the transcription is generated by speech recognition (Col. 7, lines 39-64).

Regarding claim 46, Wactlar discloses identifying start and end points of speech segments in the transcription (Col. 8, lines 15-20), extracting from the video index start and end points of the segments (Col. 11, lines 43-67), and concurrent use of image and speech timing information to increase the reliability (Col. 12, lines 41-51). Wactlar does not appear to recognize outputting all speech segments that have non-zero temporal intersection with the respective face segment. However, Girod discloses outputting all speech segments that have non-zero temporal intersection with the respective face segment (Col. 3, lines 31-50; Col. 6, lines 49-67, Col. 7, lines 1-21; Col. 10, lines 25-33). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the speech segments disclosed by Wactlar to include outputting all speech segments that have non-zero temporal intersection with the respective face segment. The motivation for doing so would have been because it increases the reliability of the system by processing the audio signal in response to the detected movement of a person in a video signal thereby permitting elimination of background noise from sites where the person is not speaking. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined Wactlar with Girod to obtain the invention as specified in claim 46.

7. Claims 16, 31, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") as applied to claims 6, 22, and 35 above.

Regarding claims 16 and 31, Ariki discloses grouping tracks containing similar faces (Abstract; Sect. 1) and recording time sections along with their names as indices (Abstract). While Ariki does not appear to expressly state merging tracks containing similar faces from a plurality of face tracks, it would have been obvious in light of his disclosure.

Regarding claim 36, Ariki discloses including annotations (e.g. name) associated with the face track (Abstract; Sect. 8), but does not appear to recognize displaying a list. However, generating and displaying a list of data is well known and routinely utilized in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the annotations disclosed by Ariki to include displaying them as a list because it provides a visual aid to the user.

8. Claims 51 and 52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") and Nam et al. ("Speaker Identification and Video Analysis for Hierarchical Video Shot Classification").

Regarding claim 51, Ariki et al. ("Ariki") discloses extracting from the video track face segments representing human faces and producing a face track for each individual face (Abstract; Sect. 1). Ariki does not appear to disclose extracting audio segments. However, Nam et al. ("Nam") discloses extracting audio segments from the audio track (Abstract), fitting a model based on a set of audio segments corresponding to the individual of video (Sect. 2.2), and associating the model with the video track of the corresponding individual (Sect. 1, Sect. 2). Ariki and Nam are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of video

Art Unit: 2623

indexing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the face indexing disclosed by Ariki to include associating audio information with the corresponding face track. The motivation for doing so would have been because both tracks provide important information to understand and organize the video data in an efficient manner. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ariki with Nam to obtain the invention as specified in claim 51.

Regarding claim 52, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 51 are applicable to claim 52. Nam discloses the audio segments are speech segments (Sect. 1).

9. Claims 19-21 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") as applied to claims 6 and 22 above, and further in view of Podilchuk ("Face Recognition Using DCT-Based Feature Vectors").

Regarding claims 19-21 and 24-26, Ariki discloses face regions but does not specify including eye, nose, and mouth templates, image coordinates of geometric face features, or coefficients of the eigen-face representation. However, Podilchuk discloses that it is well known to use templates based on facial parts, geometric face features, and eigen-face representations (Sect. 1; Sect. 3). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include templates, geometric features, or eigen-face representation. Applicant has not disclosed that either one provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the face region disclosed by Ariki or using templates, geometric features, or eigen-face representation because they perform

Art Unit: 2623

the same function of face detection. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ariki with Podilchuk to obtain the invention as specified in claims 19-21 and 24-26.

10. Claims 7, 8-10, 28, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") as applied to claims 6, 22, and 37 above, and further in view of Wactlar et al. (5,835,667).

Regarding claims 7, 28, and 38, Ariki does not appear to recognize including audio data. Wactlar discloses associating audio data with video data (Abstract). Ariki and Wactlar are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of video indexing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the face indexing disclosed by Ariki to include associating audio information with the corresponding face track. The motivation for doing so would have been because both tracks provide important information to understand and organize the video data in an efficient manner. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ariki with Wactlar to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7, 28, and 38.

Regarding claim 8, Ariki discloses generating a face index from the sequence of video frames (Abstract). The arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 7 are applicable to claim 8. Wactlar discloses generating an index from a video track (Col. 11, lines 43-63, Col. 12, lines 1-40), generating a transcription of the audio track (Col. 7, lines 39-67, Col. 8, lines 1-14), and aligning the transcription with the video index (Col. 8, lines 15-19).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 7 are applicable to claims 9 and 10. Wactlar discloses the transcription of the audio data is generated by closed-caption decoding and speech recognition (Col. 7, lines 39-64).

11. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") and Wactlar (5,835,667) as applied to claims 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Girod (6,483,532).

Regarding claim 11, Wactlar discloses identifying start and end points of speech segments in the transcription (Col. 8, lines 15-20), extracting from the video index start and end points of the segments (Col. 11, lines 43-67), and concurrent use of image and speech timing information to increase the reliability (Col. 12, lines 41-51). Wactlar does not appear to recognize outputting all speech segments that have non-zero temporal intersection with the respective face segment. However, Girod discloses outputting all speech segments that have non-zero temporal intersection with the respective face segment (Col. 3, lines 31-50; Col. 6, lines 49-67, Col. 7, lines 1-21; Col. 10, lines 25-33). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the speech segments disclosed by Ariki and Wactlar to include outputting all speech segments that have non-zero temporal intersection with the respective face segment. The motivation for doing so would have been because it increases the reliability of the system by processing the audio signal in response to the detected movement of a person in a video signal thereby permitting elimination of background noise from sites where the person is not speaking. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have combined Ariki and Wactlar with Girod to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, Ariki discloses tracking face regions (Abstract) but neither Ariki nor Wactlar appear to recognize detecting mouth motion. However, Girod discloses tracking face segments 356 in a video track (Figure 3), detecting segments having mouth motion 358 (Figure 3), and estimating from the detected segments, those having talking mouth motion vs. non-talking mouth motion (Abstract; Col. 6, lines 49-67, Col. 7, lines 1-21). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the face detection disclosed by Ariki and Wactlar to include detecting mouth motion. The motivation for doing so would have been because it is well known and routinely utilized in the art of face detection and increases the versatility of the system by determining if the person is talking. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ariki and Wactlar with Girod to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim 13, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 12 are applicable to claim 13. Girod discloses segments estimated to have talking mouth motion are enabled for attaching speech to a speaker in a face segment (Col. 10, lines 25-33).

12. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") and Wactlar (5,835,667) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Nam et al. ("Speaker Identification and Video Analysis for Hierarchical Video Shot Classification").

Regarding claim 14, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 7 are applicable to claim 14. Wactlar does not appear to recognize fitting a model based on the extracted audio data. However, Nam et al. ("Nam") discloses extracting audio segments from the audio track (Abstract), fitting a model based on a set of audio segments corresponding to the

Art Unit: 2623

individual of video (Sect. 2.2), and associating the model with the video track of the corresponding individual (Sect. 1, Sect. 2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the face indexing disclosed by Ariki and Wactlar to include associating audio information with the corresponding face track. The motivation for doing so would have been because both tracks provide important information to understand and organize the video data in an efficient manner and further enhance the searching capability of the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ariki and Wactlar with Nam to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 14 are applicable to claim 15. Nam discloses the audio segments are speech segments (Sect. 1).

13. Claims 53, 54, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") in view of Belongie et al. ("Color- Texture-Based Image Segmentation Using EM and Its Application to Content-Based Image Retrieval").

Regarding claim 53, Ariki discloses a processor for processing a collection of images to extract therefrom features characteristic of objects, and for outputting therefrom indexing data with respect to the features (Abstract; Sect. 1-2) and storing indexing data outputted from the processor in groups according to the features selected for extraction (Sect. 6; Sect. 8). Ariki does not appear to disclose including a user interface for selecting the features to be extracted to enable searching for and identifying individual members of the class of objects. However, Belongie et al. ("Belongie") discloses including a user interface for selecting features to be extracted to enable searching for and identifying individual members (Sect. 1). At the time of

Art Unit: 2623

the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the feature extraction disclosed by Ariki to include a user interface. The motivation for doing so would have been because it is well known in the art and it facilitates classification or retrieval of the individual members.

Regarding claim 54, Ariki discloses a browser-searcher for browsing and searching the store of indexing data to locate particular members of the class of objects (Sect. 1).

Regarding claim 57, the arguments analogous to those presented above for claim 53 are applicable to claim 57. Ariki discloses facial feature extraction to enable searching for individual human faces (Abstract).

14. Claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ariki et al. ("Face Indexing on Video Data – Extraction, Recognition, Tracking and Modeling") in view of Belongie et al. ("Color- Texture-Based Image Segmentation Using EM and Its Application to Content-Based Image Retrieval") as applied to claim 54 above, and further in view of King et al. (5,600,775).

Regarding claims 55 and 56, Ariki and Belongie do not appear to disclose including an editor for scanning the indexing store and for correcting errors occurring therein. However, King et al. ("King") discloses including an editor for scanning the indexing data store and correcting errors and annotating the indexing data store with annotations (Abstract; Col. 2, lines 3-67, Col. 3, lines 1-35; Figure 5). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the indexing disclosed by Ariki and Belongie to include an editor. The motivation for doing so would have been because it is a well known graphical user interface and enhances the systems searching and indexing capabilities. Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2623

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Ariki and Belongie with King to obtain the invention as specified in claims 55 and 56.

Other Prior Arts Cited

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,655,058 to Balasubramanian et al. for segmentation of audio data for indexing of conversational speech for real-time or postprocessing applications;

Malik et al., "Finding Objects In Image Databases by Grouping," IEEE 1996, pages 761-764;

Carson et al., "Region-Based Image Querying," IEEE 1997, pages 42-49;

Lebourgeois et al., "Towards a Description for Video Indexation," IEEE, August 16-20, 1998, pages 912-915;

Wang et al., "A Highly Efficient System for Automatic Face Region Detection in MPEG Video," IEEE 1997, pages 615-628; and

Chan et al., "Video Shot Classification Using Human Faces," IEEE 1996, pages 843-846.

Contact Information

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia M Kibler whose telephone number is (703) 306-4072.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00 - 5:30 and every other Friday.

Art Unit: 2623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Virginia Kibler
06/14/04

MEHRDAD DASTOURI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

